Demand for stopping Naxalite activities in Andhra Pradesh

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, during the last three years and under the regime of the then Chief Minister, the State of Andhra Pradesh was full of Naxalite activities and since then the Naxalite activities have become part of life. These activities are gradually growing and resulting in murders and disruption of peaceful life including industrial activity. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to a news item published on March 1, 1990 in a local daily. I quote: "Five workers were killed and over 50 in red when a group of armed men, said to be supporters of a trade union leader, Mr. G. Basi Reddy, who was formerly of the Indian Federation of Trade Unions which belonged to the Naxalites attacked the workers on duty in a spinning mill at chitkul, near Patancheru industrial area around midnight". This place is 31 KM away from Hyderabad. They killed five people inside the premises of the mill and injured 40 people. This is only one of the instances and like this continuously the peaceful life and the industrial activity is being disrupted every day. Since Mr. N. T. Rama Rao is the Chairman of the National Front Government, I request him that they should not encourage Naxalite activity because in the long run it is Andhra Pradesh which is going to suffer. I also request the State Government to provide protection to the peace-loving citizens of Andhra Pradesh. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The State Government also should take action.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—(Contd.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we will take up further discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. We have very limited time, I would request the Members — there is hardly anybody here— to abide by the time. Shri P. Shiv Shanker. That does not include you because you can utilise your party's time.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, I seem to be speaking practically to the empty benches but I cannot help it. I speak on the motion to thank the President for his Address. I must frankly submit that most of the Address is merely platitudinous. To me it appeared as though it was a pep talk and makes a brave face. I would only touch three or four points which I found have not been taken care of by most of the speakers who have already spoken. Madam, in a very complex and multiple society like ours, confrontation does not pay. No authority whatsoever can indulge in confrontation much less the Government. But off and on, I have been reading, hearing this Government trying to say, that they have for the first time evolved a process of consensus for the purposes of resolving the issues. As I said it is undoubtedly a virtue in a society like ours. We should develop consensus, but the grievance, the agony, the anguish that I have is that this Government off and on is repeating like a parrot that they would ilke to evolve a consensus, to make a virtue of a necessity. If I have to say it in Urdu, it is:

मजबूरी का नाम खुदा है ।

What else this Government could do? This Government, firstly, consists of quite a few parties in the National Front, regional and otherwise. It is being supported by the left and the right, both, and every one has divergent views. When it comes to the question of a serious issue, we have already said that we will extend our constructive cooperation. So they have to necessarily seek the constructive cooperation of ours. Therefore,

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

they are bound to develop a consensus. They have got to rely on other parties for the purpose of support. They cannot take a decision on their own. And when they are trying to say that they will evolve a consensus and that they are starting a new culture, I am rather surprised because they have no other way except to please every one and to take into account the views expressed by others and go by them. As I said-and I will repeat—They are making a virtue of a necessity. Where is this leading? I will give a concrete example of Punjab. In Punjab, the situation has come to pass where Govt. seem to have no policy whatsoever. In the process of oft-repeated concept of evolving a consensus, you are allowing the situation to drift from bad to worse. What is it that is happening in Punjab? One does not know what you would like to do after the Presidential rule is over in May 1990. The other day, Budget estimates for Punjab were presented to this House for 1990-91. Of course it was said that it was for six months. They have not been able to make up their mind at all. And what is their policy? One would like to know. The way they have been hobnobbing with some of the people who are taking extreme positions gives a clear impression that they seem to be swinging like a pendulum from one end to the other as a result even the Mann group has taken a very strident approach on the issue of Punjab. The atleast resolutions that have been passed clearly show that they are taking a very hard line which is going to create a lot of complications for the nation itself. They had been trying to hobnob with the Mann group and have not had any clear approach in the matter which has brought the situation to such a pass where it might move into a situation which might become irretrievable shortly. The steps that this Government has been taking have been such which have not been infusing any confidence whatsoever. The rate of murders is increasing in Punjab every day. If yesterday there was a particular number of deaths, today it is more. But the misfortune is, there is no policy whatsoever. I am going to refer one aspect which rather troubles me and I am not sure whether somebody has taken up this issue. The Government is often saying that it has fulfilled the promise of repealing the 59th Amendment. Firstly, the emergency powers were taken by virtue of the 59th Amendment. This is by virtue of section 3 of the Constitution (Fifty Ninth Amendment) Act, 1988 by virtue of which article 359A was added. Under this article, clause 2 thereof categorically said that the Amendment made to the Constitution by sub-section (1), that is adding 359A(1) shall cease to operate on the expiry of a period of two years from the commencement of this Act. This it was to lapse in March, 1990 itself. Secondly, this provision was never brought into force at all though the powers were taken. Taking into consideration in 1987 and 1988 as to what was the situation in Punjab and having regard to the postures of Pakistan and also of China, while the powers were taken so that in an emergency we should be in a position to act, it goes to the credit of the then Government that at no point of time this provision was brough into force and it was sought to be kept totally a temporary provision. But what has happened by repealing the entire Amendment? I am rather surprised as to what has happened to their legal luminaries? We are sitting on the other side. Why had they not gone into the issue? I am rather getting surprised because Government have also repealed section 2 of the 59th Amendment Section 2 said:—

> "In article 356 of the Constitution, in clause 5 for the proviso the following proviso shall be substituted, namely,
>
> Provided that nothing in this clause shall apply to the proclamation issued under clause 1 on the eleventh day of May, 1987 with respect to the State of Punjab".

This has also been repealed and you know what the consequence of this is. The Presidential Rule under Article 356(4) has to be only for six months in the initial stage. This could be extended by another six months. That is all. It is no doubt true that it has been said that it could be continued for a further period of another two years, namely, making it a total of 3 years but the two-year period is subject to two conditions. After one year, if you want to extend it further, then you will have to follow what clause (5) of article 356 says. Article 356(5) of the Constitution says:

> "(a) a Proclamation of Emergency is in operation in the whole of India or, as the case may be, in the whole or any part of the State, at the time of passing of such a resolution, and
>
> (b) the Election Commissioner certifies that the continuance in force of the Proclamation approved under clause (3) during the period specified in such resolution is necessary on account of difficulties in holding general elections to the legislative Assembly of the State concerned."

These two pre-conditions are necessary for the purposes of extending the Presidential Rule beyond one year. These two pre-conditions were never brought into operation, but a proviso was added. But that proviso has been repealed and it has come in the papers that the President has assented to this Constitutional amendment repeal on the 5th of January. That means that from the 5th of January the proviso goes, there is no Proclamation of Emergency, there is no prior sanction of the Chief Election Commissioner and there is a total Constitutional lacunae. The Government is being run by a Governor who cannot run at all. The Presidential Rule comes to an end on the date on which the President has assented to the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, and things are going on like that still. I do not know whether somebody has taken it up in the court of law or not and I must say that it is difficult whether even the provisions of the General Clauses Act would ever come to the rescue in such a repeal. The Government seems to be totally bankrupt. They have not even applied their mind on this issue. On the contrary, things are going on. This is where, in an ordinary matter like this, they could have gone into but they have not gone into, and the situation is I would submit that it is a Constitutional collapse, collapse of the administration, as for Punjab is concerned. Today, you cannot say that legally there is a Government which exists there. This is the misfortune in which we have been placed. But off and on, they go on talking about it and are trying to take credit saying that they have repealed the 59th Amendment.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY (West Bengal): You agreed to it.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Yes, we agreed to it and without our support you could never have repealed it. But you could have seen to it that clause 2 of the 59th Amendment was not repealed and, by repealing it, you have now created chaos in the State. You people asked for our support and we gave it. It is bankruptcy on the part of the Government? First, you admit that you are bankrupt.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: We are not creating chaos, but you are creating chaos.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: We are not creating chaos. You are with the Government and we are not in the Government. The other point that I would like to submit is that President's Address says that "as a measure of the commitment to the weaker sctions, some more land reforms are being placed in the Ninth Schedule". As a lawyer, I have always

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

felt that the Ninth Schedule has been an umbrella against the onslaught of wind, rain and sun, that is, against the onslaught of articles 14, 19 and 31 of the Constitution. But what has happened? A large number of laws have been included in the Ninth Schedule and one has only to read those laws to feel fully disappointed because so many laws have been included. It is not a question of merely including the laws in that Schedule but it is a matter of the sincerity in implementing those laws, those land reform laws, where we have failed. I am not saying that we have not failed. When vested interests take over political power, take over administration,—whether they belong to your party or my party is not important; that is immaterial—and when they are not inherently sincere to implement those laws, the situation that we face then is what have been facing in Andhra Pradesh now or in Bihar or even in certain other places. I would not like to spare my own party people also when I am speaking on this issue. It is we who had brought got in the Ninth Schedule. It is we who had included more than about 200 laws in the Ninth Schedule. It is not a question of mere inclusion. That is where I say that this is only a make-believe affair when you say 'earnest commitment to weaker sections'. Weaker sections have become a play—thing for all of us, whether these sitting on your side or sitting on my side. We would like to exploit on this basis and a large number of political personalities who are very influential but none the less are not sincere in their commitment to these weaker sections, talk of them very well because of votes. We talk of them, we exploit them. None the less, the situation is we were not sincere in the implementation of laws, I am aware in Andhra Pradesh the manner in which the landholdings became benami, in the name of some buffalo, in the name of some cow; people have so done it. This is the reality of the situation. But then what is most important is that sincerity in implementation of laws alone will alleviate the grievances; otherwise, it is meaningless. You bring 100 laws and put them in the Ninth Schedule. It is not going to serve any purpose.

Another thing where I would like to join issue with the ruling party is, there seems to be a lot of difference between their precept and practice with reference to various matters. If you look at the manifesto of the National Front Government it baldly says that debts below Rs. 10,000 would be waived. When it comes to the question of practice, they have been hobnobbing and in the ultimate analysis the way the Budget proposal itself has come, shows that the Central Government is not going to bear the burden more than Rs. 800 crores in any form; that too they can avoid by trying to say you are a wilful defaulter. The burden was to be Rs. 14,000 crores and by just shifting it to the State Governments by saying that as far as cooperative loans are concerned it is the State Governments which have to bear — more than 90% of the farmers' loans are in the cooperative sector; they are not in the sector of nationalised banks. You are not trying to share even 10%. And there also you have put ifs and buts. You have put it in a different formula altogether. Equally, if you look at the manifesto of the National Front they have said that the National Front would include the right to work in the Fundamental Rights of the Constitution. That is all and nothing beyond that. Does it take much time for Government to do that? Once having come into power you have started hobnobbing with things because you know the reality. The reality is that you have promised something which you could not have fulfilled; something which requires not thousands but lakhs of crores of rupees. It amounts to an insurance on unemployment. But now having made the promise and being in power, since you are not in a position to fulfil, you would like to tinker with that.

Equally take the Mandal Commission Report. On the Mandal Commission Report, you have categorically said—in fact the President's Address has observed the previous Address has also said—that the recommendations of the Mandal Commission would be implemented. You have appointed a Cabinet Committee to go into it. Why? If you have said in the Manifesto that you will implement it, nothing prevented you from implementing it. But your designs and your sincerity stand quesioned. You are not sincere and find yourself in a difficult situation. I can multiply these examples. But I would rest content myself by only referring to these three to show that there is a lot of difference between precept and practice as far as this Government is concerned.

One issue which they have stressed so strongly is that of strong and vibrant democratic institutions and sound and lasting values practised by this Government. This is what the Presidential Address says. I would only like to ask: Have you stood by the democratic institutions and have established sound values in removing or in asking all the Governors to resign at one stretch? Have you not appointed highly political persons to those positions? What have you done with this democratic institution? Then the Home Minister goes on record to say that Govenor is a representative of the Central Government. I am also surprised that one of the Governors has gone to the extent of saying that whenever a Governments changes Governors must change.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Mirza Irshadbaig) in the Chair.]

What are you doing with these institutions? Don't you think you have eroded and devalued these institutions? In 1977 the then Janata Government by dissolving eleven Assemblies created a situation as a precedent. We in 1980 did the same thing. You have not resorted to it this time because you knew that if you resort to the dissolution of Assemblies you have to equally dissolve the Kerala Assembly as also the Tamil Nadu Assembly. Deliberately you have not done it and you want to make a virtue of itby saying that this is a democratic approach which you have taken. Please do not act so only for purposes of scoring points over us. Equally what have you done by removed of all the members of the Planning Commission by one stroke of pen? Have you established a good precedent? What happened to these democratic institutions of which you are talking? Equally while shuffling and re-shuffling and appointing various officials to ambassadorial positions in different countries how are you acting? The way you have conferred honours on the Republic Day, does it speak high of you? You talk of values! You talk of democratic institutions. I am giving only some examples of the manner in which you have been conducting yourself within 100 days.

You would like to boast of it; fair enough. You boast. What is it that you have said on Bofors? You have been harping all through during the elections that within one month you will be revealing the names of those who are involved in Bofors. You are still hobnobbing with it in one form or another. I am sure you would like to continue with it for another five years if you ever last that period. People like us here are very keen that whoever are responsible in the Bofors affairs should have been quickly prosecuted. They should be brought to book and the law must take its owr course but the law cannot take its own course for decades. Our Government had taken a certain view which may be wrong. You had gone all over the country and you had been pointing the needle of suspicion towards the then Prime Minister. Then you should prove it, otherwise you are dishonest in your approach. You are just sitting tight or you are just quibbling with it. After every 10 or 15 days you [illegible]

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

a hand-out in the newspapers only to show that you are keeping it alive. That is not the correct approach. I am sorry, I would not like to multiply these examples. You have been speaking about institutions and about democracy and about the values with reference to these institutions. It is merely a tall talk. It is nothing but hypocrisy. It only shows the insincere designs on your part.

The Address also says that elections should be rid of the debilitating effect of money and muscle power. Within 90 or 100 days, have you stood by it? *Take Haryana. Take Meham and the* manner in which elections have taken place there. You might say as a party: "Well, look, we said that there should be a repoll." A very good political strategy indeed, blowing hot and cold in the same breath. How is it that it has been countermanded? *Countermanding means* fresh filing of nomiaations. What is it that you are talking about? Voices have been heard from your side only that in the last election a large number of criminals and musclemen have been given the tickets. I am not saying that from my side. It has come from your side only. You talk of the election system which must be rid of the debilitating effect of the muscle power. What values are there?

I would not like to go into further aspects because I have taken quite a bit of time. I only wanted to intervene in a few matters. You speak of taking measures to strengthen secularism. I would like to tell you that for the first time this country faces a great misfortune and I am worried that the country's future itself seems to be at stake. For the first time, the ruling party is guided, supported and helped by the communalists and the fanatic forces in the majority community of this country. This is a dangerous sign; a most dangerous sign which is a matter of not only concern for every right-minded person, but I am afraid this migh' lead to a lack of confidence in large gments of the society in this country. Already things have started, be it at Jamshedpur, be it at Mehsana or be it at Delhi. It is not even 100 days that have passed. The effect is going to be horrible. The fanatics in the majority community are a great danger. This shakes the very roots of our democracy, the secular base of this country. I am not sure how we will be able to fight it out? I am aware that a large number of people sitting on that side are highly right-minded on this issue. But, will you be able to fight it out? You cannot because you have got to live on their support; you have got to survive on their support. That is why it is not possible for you. Instances are already pouring in, trickling in the manner in which these fanctics are influencing this Government. I need not repeat them, but this is where we are. I do not know what prudence was there with respect to the statement on Chakmas. The misfortune is that today the Soviet Union has diluted its stand on Kashmir. I doubt whether they are going to exercise their veto tomorrow if a horrible situation comes up. Please take care that while you rule, you rule with determination. As I was trying to say, your capacity to take the decisions is non-existent because you are more concerned with consensus. Your weakness is that you are a minority Government. As I said, with quite a large number of parties within the Government and two Left and Right parties to support you, this disables you to take a decision on difficult occasions and that is why you are not able to take any decision on Punjab. That is why, even with reference to Kashmir all the parties tried to support you so that you could take a firm decision and act on that basis. In the last general elections where the verdict has certainly been there that the Congress must be out of power, it is unfortunate that no single party has been given the majority so that the country could be ruled in the proper manner. Thus all that you have been boasting in the Presidential Address, as I said, is thing but platitudes. Thank you very much, Sir.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to Shri Shiv Shanker for very sharply outlining the various points on which the Opposition feels strongly. I have been hearing the various speakers from the Opposition over the last three or four days that we have been discussing the President's Address, and the major points raised by all of them are Punjab, Kashmir, Ram Janmabhumi, and the communal situation. That is one part of it. The other part is that they have been saying that this Government is a minority Government, it is depending on support from contradictory parties and, therefore, unable to decide things. Mr. Shiv Shanker just now said that this Government is unable to take decisions.

Sir, at the outset, let me make it very clear that merely in numbers one party may not have a majority. And as he rightly pointed out, he thought that the electoral verdict was against the Congress and it would have been much better if one party had a majority. But after all the wisdom of the electorate is supreme in a democratic society. So, that is not in our hands. The electorate has chosen a Parliament of a particular complexion. And that is how our Government has come into being. But, on the question of the ability to make decisions, let me make it very clear on behalf of our Party and on behalf of the National Front Government that as far as implementation of the Manifesto is concerned, as far as sticking to the basic philosophy which is accepted probably by all parties cutting across party lines, democracy, secularism, socialism, bringing up the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, other backward classes, giving opportunities to women etc. I do not think there is a scope for a debate on it. The second part is valid and that is having said that, what is the Government doing in concrete terms and ...*(Interruptions)*... Beg your pardon.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): No, I do not want to interrupt you.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Even if you do, I do not mind.

Now, Sir, hundred days. I do not think is a proper milestone to take a balance sheet of the Government. What you could not achieve in 42 years with respect to Mandal Commission, with respect to other backward classes, in 100 days you are turning back to us and saying, what have you done? I do not think it is fair. We are looking at it. Sincerity in implementing promises must be there.

Now you take the three issues which are burning issues. And I repeat that I do not think that these issues are light. Take Punjab, for instance. We are all appalled by the killings there. But I am sorry to tell Mr. Shiv Shanker that the Members of his party at least in the Rajya Sabha, I do not know in Lok Sabha, what I see in the Rajya Sabha is that they are not serious about these issues. They are serious about scoring points. Otherwise, 31 people being killed in Punjab yesterday cannot be raised by way of a special mention. A special mention is supposed to be replied to by the Government in three months' time. It is a totally wrong way of bringing it up before the House. I can understand if you demand a statement from the Home Minister and Mr. Gujral has said that the Home Minister has gone to Punjab for an on-the-spot inquiry, and he will come back to the House tomorrow and make a statement. I do not think any Government can be more responsive than that. But even after saying that, I heard in the morning, no, statement must be made today, why has the Home Minister gone to Punjab, Punjab is being treated as a stepchild. I am sorry.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I would not disagree to what you have said. But individual Members, you cannot stop from making mentions. That does not mean that it is a party-line. After all, so far as the statements are concerned, they belong to the individuals. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Thank you, Mr. Shiv Shanker. Pawan, I am not yielding to you.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Nobody has said, "why has the Home Minister gone to Punjab". Nobody has said that.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Anyway, I do not want to score a point on Punjab. On Punjab, the Prime Minister has said that the whole nation is agonised. Punjab is not only an integral part of India, the feelings of the people of Punjab, unless they come back to the mainstream, the whole country is at its wit's end. Unfortunately, the Kashmir situation has overtaken and become more serious than Punjab. Now, talking about that, since Mr. Bansal interrupted me, in the morning there was a comment that this Government has appointed a Ministers for Kashmir affairs. Well they also can appoint a Minister for Punjab Affairs. I agree with Mr. Shiv Shanker, individual Members do not mean a party line. But I must tell my hon. friends on the other side, do not make a joke of it. Kashmir, suggestion for a Minister for Kashmir Affairs came from an all-Party committee in which Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was there. It was not a decision of this Government. If a Minister has been appointed for Kashmir Affairs, it is to make that Ministry a focal point to quickly sort out matters relating to Kashmir. If an all-party committee feels that a Minister for Punjab Affairs is required tomorrow, nothing is wrong with it. But to make fun of a Ministry of Kashmir Affairs is no way to deal with either Kashmir or Punjab.

On these two issues, Punjab and Kashmir, I can do no better than what the Prime Minister has said. And that is that we will go by national consensus, we will not stand on prestige, we will negotiate with every party, with every group, with every person who can help sort out the problem. It is not a question of party. It is a national problem. We wish to see a peaceful Kashmir and a peaceful Punjab and for that purpose there is no problem, there is no politics. Who has won elections, who has lost elections, is not relevant. And that is what the Prime Minister's stand is and I am sure that the Government will follow that. And if at any time the Opposition feels that the Government is taking unilateral steps and they can contribute, please object to it and our allies, the Left parties and the BJP they are not unconditionally supporting us if we do not follow our manifesto. They are welcome. It is their duty to correct us if we go wrong. Even the Opposition should not hesitate to do it. But if you go on merely repeating that the Government is sleeping, that the Ministers are sleeping, that we are doing nothing, that people are being killed in Punjab, etc., I do not think that will solve the problem.

On the communal situation, particularly, in regard to the Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid issue, let me make the stand of our party very clear. Mr. Shiv Shanker very rightly said that if fanaticism goes on, if the Hindu fanatics or the majority community fanatics influence the decisions of the Government, the country will be on fire. Please take my assurance for what it is worth. The Janata Dal, the National Front and this Government are committed to secularism as enunciated by Gandhiji in the freedom struggle. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru once said that the communalism of the minority will destroy the minority but the communalism of the majority will destroy the nation. I do not think what he said can be more relevant today than ever before. It is very relevant. I would give an example here. Mrs. Margaret Alva referred in her speech to the Shiv Sena. Even at the cost of losing the electoral battle, we refused to have any truck with the Shiv Sena in Maharashtra. We, as a party, differentiate between the BJP and the Shiv Sena.

AN HON. MEMBER: *Via* the BJP, you go.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: There is no time to discuss polemics here. Now, the BJP has been in existence in one form or the other for the last thirty-forty years. We may not agree with them.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Morarka, I do not doubt your sincerity at all. I know that many of you who are sitting there are highly secular. I have nothing to hide. But the point is, the other side takes advantage of it. You are absolutely chaste. I am not saying anything against you. But obviously, these fanatical elements will have an upper hand. You cannot help it.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I can assure Mr. Shiv Shanker that on matters concerning communal harmony, on matters concerning the peaceful existence of all religions in this country, our Government is not going to be cowed down by any sectarian or parochial approach, be it from one party or the other. I do not think we need to have much discussion on this. There are parties in the country who have a particular point of view. You have talked about the BJP. I must add here even by slightly crossing Parliamentary ethics, that last year, when we were on the other side, when debates took place in the House, there were umpteen times when I found many Congressmen nodding very appreciatively whenever Shri Advani spoke. Those were the issues on which secular Congress men can never agree. But we found to our dismay—I think it is being corrected now—that the Congress Party steered off course as far as communal harmony was concerned. I do not want to repeat. For example, they drafted Arun Govil for campaigning. There cannot be a worst kind of populism to appease the Hindu majority. The BJP has not done that. I spoke about it last year at the time of the discussion on the President's Address and said 'Your party which boasts of secularism should not stoop to this level just for the sake of winning one or two elections; it will not help'. Of course, there are parties which openly play the Hindu card. Not us. Neither we support them nor we seek their support. In regard to the BJP, I would like to point out one thing here. The BJP in its election manifesto and in the speeches of their leaders—we did not agree with them on many things—talked of positive secularism. But they never openly played the Hindu card as was done by the Shiv Sena in Maharashtra or the Congress in parts of the U.P. and Bihar. You can rest assured on this front that this Government will not allow communal disharmony to erupt in this country. Of course, there have been communal riots. Something happened in Delhi two-three days ago.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Mr. Morarka, for your information, may I just say this? You have said about Arun Govil. Of course, if he had campaigned dressed as Rama, your objection was quite valid. Still, many of us will not approve of that. But when you say that only the Congress Party had done it, I would like to point out for your information that both the villains of the 'Ramayan' and the 'Mahabharat' campaigned actively for your nominees as well as for the BJP nominees in the recent Assembly elections. One of them is being brought to the Rajya Sabha. Therefore, do not say that you have stayed away from that. It is not true.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I repeat, as far as the Janata Dal is concerned—though Mr. Anand Sharma is a dear friend of mine—we deplore the tendency of using mythological Hindu figures to win votes. We are totally against this. The other thing that surprised me is, in most of the speeches there is a reference to foreign policy. I though that was one area where there is hardly any disagree-

[Shri Kamal Morarka]

ment but I see one amendment moved to the President's Address in which it is said, it fails to say what India's new policy will be in view of the changing situation in East Europe. I think India's foreign policy is one policy which has firm foundations, it has stood the test of time. Of course, Shiv Shankerji will say our party, but the party that did that is gone dead and gone long back, but on foreign policy there need not be any disagreement. We are for non-alignment. We have had good relations with all countries in the world. We have sympathised with freedom struggles everywhere in the world. Today the best test is Namibia which is getting independence and both, the Prime Minister and Shri Rajiv Gandhi, are going there. So, I do not think in 100 days anything has happened. If we deviate from our foreign policy, it is another matter, but I am surprised to find this kind of amendments moved.

Then, of course, there is a lot of talk of Meham and electoral reforms. On the individual incident of Meham I have nothing to say. I do not think in the President's Address which enunciates the policy of the Government, there is any place to discuss what happened in a particular constituency. On electoral reforms, do you expect us to unilaterally make reforms? Certainly not. We are wedded to our commitment to have a consensus of all political parties. On that there is a Committee under Mr. Dinesh Goswamy which will arrive at what all parties agree for free and fair elections. Then if we do not implement it, please catch us. This is our first President's Address. There was one, of course, in December for a very short session, but this is the first president's Address enunciating the policy of this Government. If you find that this Address does not conform to the pledges we have made in our manifesto, please point them out. Nobody has done that. Now you are saying, we are only saying but doing nothing. It is a funny logic. In 1985 when you came with a mandate of 400 people you claimed to change India into a land of milk and honey. Though we knew that you won't do it, we never told you in the President's Address that you won't do it. We waited patiently till you did the miracle of losing the mandate four hundred people. You frittered away in three years. That kind of competence we do not have. We waited for five years and now you are calling this a weak Government. Again I quote the Prime Minister that I may be a weak man but you have been fighting this man for 3½ years and you know the result. Just now we have begun this Government. It is just hundred days old. Please tell us where we have gone wrong. Please tell us.

On debt relief, in the manifesto we said that the farmers who have taken loan below Rs. 10,000 we will give relief to them and the complaint is... I shall be happy to have the indulgence of Shri Shiv Shanker. M. Shiv Shanker, kindly be a little more attentive. I would like to have the indulgencies of the Leader of the Opposition. Shri Shiv Shanker referred to debt relief to farmers. Now it is pointed out that Mr. Dandavate in his budget has said that wilful defaulters will not get it. When we made this promise in the manifesto, the criticism was that public funds are being frittered away, confidence in the banking system will go, you cannot write off loans like this. And when Mr. Dandavate has made the arithmetic and taken precautions to keep that promise within the banking system, without losing the confidence, again you are saying that this was not your promise. I personally feel that you should be fair enough. What is the basic aim? The aim is that the poorest of the farmer should get the relief. The aim is not to write off...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Did you not play that game at the time when you included this in your manifesto?

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: In the manifesto we said that we will give relief to farmers who have taken loans upto Rs. 10,000. (*Interruptions*). After our manifesto, you started changing the Chief Ministers. Each Chief Minister was promising a bigger bonanza to the farmers. It had no effect on the voting. They still lost office.

श्री राम नरेश यादव : मैं यह कह रहा था कि आपने कहा कि मैनिफेस्टो में हमने यह नहीं कहा कि हम राइट-आफ करेंगे बल्कि यह कहा कि हम उसमें रिलिफ देंगे। मैं फिर यह कहता हूं कि स्पष्ट रूप से लिखा है कि 10 हजार तक कर्जे राइट-आफ होंगे। रिलिफ दिया जायेगा, ऐसा नहीं है।

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Let us be very clear. The language used in the budget yesterday—'debtrelief' does not mean anything elese except waiving. It is a write-off. I was surprised, yesterday people were talking, "this is only relief; this is not waiving". It is waiving. Loans *below ten thousand rupees will be* waived subject to certain conditions. If Mr. Bansal or I have taken a loan, it will not be waived.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: The condition put there is, if the farmer has taken a loan from the nationalised bank, only then it will be waived. If it is from the cooperative *bank in a village, then it will not* be waived. The farmers are used to taking loans from the cooperative banks and not from the nationalised banks.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I will meet that point. Yesterday's Budget has said, nationalised banks and Regional Rural Banks which are under the nationalised banks. It has also said, a similar scheme will be implemented by the various State Governments in relation to loans from the cooperative banks...The Budget cannot commit about a State Government. After all it is a federal system.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: If you can commit to reimburse the Reserve Bank or the other banks for meeting those expenses, you can very well give an undertaking that you will reimburse the expenses of the State Governments.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: On that if we have fallen short of expectations. I can only promise them that whatever commitments have been made will be fulfilled, without public losing confidence in the banking system. It is not our money; it is public money.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Mr. Morarka, could you yield for a moment? I have good wishes for Mr. Kamal Morarka. He is a very well read person, but being an industrialist, he must make some difference between a loan taken by the farmer and a loan taken by an industry. I want to ask him. In the morning we were making the point that a provision of Rs. 1000 crores has been made and they want to implement it in stages. I can understand the nationalised banks banking within the frame work of baking etc. The State of Maharashtra—leave aside this waiving—where the Congress Party has won the elections, has given a concession to the weaker farmers of 4 per cent in the rate of interest and your Government and on its advice the NABARD has stopped the finances of the Maharashtra State Cooperative Bank. So this is your attitude. This 4 per cent subsidy in the rate of interest was placed by the Maharashtra Government at the disposal of the Registrar of Cooperative Societies to be used for this purpose. The argument used by NABRAD was that no profits of the banking structure can be dissipated, or whatever it is. NABARD is a bank really meant for cooperatives. In the cooperative structure, we are the owners of our own money, whether it is a bank,

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

whether it is a sugar processing society or a cotton society. So we have got objection to your providing only a thusand crores, which is totally a gimmick.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Appa Sahib's point about NABARD is valid. I can only remind him that financing of Maharashtra Cooperative Bank by NABARD came up during question hour so many time earlier at the time of the Congress Government. There are problems between NARBAD and various States Governments. Those have to be sorted out.

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI (Andhra Pradesh): That was because of differences between Mr. Sharad Pawar and the then Finance Minister and all other State Governments including the Andhra Pradesh Government suffered for it.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I will keep politics out of it though I know a lot about that. Anyway, another point made by Shri Shiv Shanker was about the Ninth Schedule. Now, Members will be surprised—unfortunately, Shiv Shankerji is not here—that Shiv Shankerji while talking about this Ninth Schedule so that said that Land Reform Acts have been put in the Ninth Schedule they get protection from challenge in the Supreme Court. Sir, the House must know—I want to place it on record—that this Ninth Schedule is meant to protect Land Reform Acts to subserve socio-economic objectives, but what are the Acts that the Congress Government had put beyond the pale of challenge? They are the Representation of People Act and MISA—the Maintenance of Internal Security Act. These are the Acts that they had put beyond the pale of challenge. There can't be a grosser misuse and abuse of the constitutional process, and that was done in the infamous 42nd Amendment which was passed in the Emergency when the Opposition Benches were empty—because they were in jail. It is a shame to the whole constitutional process, how the constitutional process had been misused. Today I am having, to my amusement and amazement, Mr. Shiv Shanker turning back at me and saying, "You are putting the Land Reform Acts in the Ninth Schedule, will you implement it? " We are in office for a 100 days. Please give us a chance. What you could not implement in 42 years, you want it to be implemented in 100 days! As I said earlier, we are flattered by your opinion of our competence. But we are not that competent: we can't do it in 100 days. Give us a chance. I can assure you, any land reform legislation, any socio-econmic legislation which this Government enacts, it will do only with the sincere desire to implement it. We do not believe in enacting what can't be implemented.

A number of other issues were raised. The main issue was communalism, which we have dealt with. Yes, Shiv Shankerji, to my utter surprise, said about "the way they are transferring officials and Ambassadors." I don't know. Under our political system of Government, is it objectionable if a new Government comes? Can't we transfer officials? Then, what is the Government meant for? Do we have to consult the Opposition whether we should appoint somebody as Finance Secretary or Home Secretary? What kind of objection is it? And about Ambassadors! I don't think, under any norms of constitutional or democratic procedure, you can object to Government placing officials. If anybody has been victimized, tell us so. But certainly the Government can select and transfer officials at its will.

Then, he talked about the Republic Day awards. Shiv Shankerji said, "The way you have given the Republic Day Awards-" (*Interruption*)... Yes. I would like to have a comparison. Somebody can make an objective comparison with me on the Republic Day awards. That is one issue on which even the tongawallah and rickshawallah in this country will bear me out. It has been used blatantly by the Congress Government to give it to people

just out of favouritism. But we never made an issue of it because there are certain things in which the Government has a privilege and a discretion. If you have the freedom to do a good thing, you have the freedom to do a bad thing also. I did not object and say why you gave Padma Bhushan to so and so. I am surprised that a person of Mr. Shiv Shanker's eminence tells me today that the Republic Day awardees are people who did these things. Of course, one thing is correct: In our list we have not followed the practice that whatever college or school the Prime Minister had been to unless you have gone to the same place you will not get an award! In the previous lists we have seen it. We can't do all that. But there is some element of judgment—and judgments can differ. Even I, individually, may not agree with so many awardees.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: If the honourable Member casts a reflection on the way the earlier Government gave the awards, I am sorry, he just cannot justify or support the awards given by the present Government to those people who only helped them to raise certain controversies about matters which had no basis.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Here I agree with you—it is a non-issue. Where am I casting aspersions I am only saying please don't bring in non-issues.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Incidentally, Sir, they pose as an open Government. I only put a question as to who, in fact, recommended giving of the awards to certain people. They say it is a matter of secret nature and cannot be disclosed in the House.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: This business of "Open Government" also in this House has become a big joke.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: They don't want to tell us as to who recommended the awards. That again, is evading a question because we wanted to let the House know that it was not the Government but somebody else, that it was the BJP and other people who influenced them in giving the awards.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I don't want to bandy words with my friend because, if I give the list of Republic Day awards in their regime, the list itself will be a source of laughter for everybody. Well, I am not in a mood for humour on these things. But the thing is, when we are debating the President's Address, we are discussing the policies of the Government, you hold this Government to solving the Kashmir problem, the Punjab problem. It is from the sublime to the ridiculous. After discussing Punjab and Kashmir you cannot start discussing why this man got the Padma Shri and that man got the Padma Bhushan. I am surprised. It is frivolous.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: You will agree that it is of material importance and, therefore, you did not ignore it.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: You are mistaken. I am not dealing with the subject. What I cannot ignore is that a man like Shiv Shankerji mentioned it. That, I cannot ignore.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He mentioned this because it is of importance.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Let us not take much time of the House.

Finally, I can only say that on the touchstone of democratic functioning, whether it is accountability to Parliament, whether it is fulfilling the promises made to the people, whether it is the Cabinet form of Government which is very important—at least on that one score please don't tell me that previously also the Cabinet was functioning—on collective decisionmaking, I don't think you will ever be able to hold this Government at fault.

[Shri Kamal Morarka]

What can be at fault—and I must admit that—is, if we expect a quick solution to the Kashmir problem, an instant solution to the Punjab problem, sorry, I don't think that is on the agenda, it cannot be done. These are problems involving human emotions in which millions of people are involved. Our Government does not believe in an instant accord; We are against it. In 1985 a lot of hope was generated, and, pardon me for saying so, I think, today the disappointment is a backlash to the hope generated at that time. So, we do not believe that in one day we can talk to one men in a room and sign an agreement. This is not a business deal. It needs patient negotiations with different groups. And the situation has been made much complicated because there is no one group either in Punjab or in Kashmir, who can claim to represent the masses of the people. You have to talk to various groups patiently. In that process we will get all the political parties who are represented in Parliament together. We will make serious efforts.

We promise you that none of our Governors, none of the Advisors to the Governors will say, "Bullet for bullet." That is banned. They are not allowed to talk like that. We do not feel that we can extinguish a problem by force because if killings could be stopped by killings, Mahatma Gandhi has lived and died in vain. We do not believe in it. We believe that anybody who is an Indian citizen, howsoever misguided he may be, howsoever angry he may be, is an Indian citizen. We have to talk to him. This is our problem.

Everytime saying "foreign hand" is no alibi. We have a hostile neighbour who is bound to take advantage of the situation. But, if our house is in order, he cannot take advantage of the situation. Our defence forces are ever ready. Our borders, we need not have any worry about. That is one part of the problem.

The other part of the problem is the internal discontent. I am sorry to say this which I said in my Kashmir speech earlier that at least we did not know that you had successfully alienated the entire population of the State. It is very difficult to regain their confidence. But we will try. And when we say, "We will try," not only we but we all should try.

Thank you.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I think, I am indeed fortunate because I am speaking after having listened to the Leader of the Opposition and to my friend, Mr. Kamal. I can very well appreciate his dilemma because being on that side now he has no option but to defend the indefensible and coin excuses for certain failures.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS WITH ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI): As you did before.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Certainly. I think the ruling party sometimes has to do that. But I am saying that it is too early in the case of this ruling party, too soon it has come.

I see no reason why our friends on the other side should get angry when we are exercising our right to point out those areas in which we feel that the present Government is not heading in the correct direction. In a democracy we have to remember that it is the duty of the Opposition, not only the right, to check the Government. I am sure, when our friends on the other side were in the Opposition, they were more vocal, more noisy in attacking the Government. Today when you are at the receiving end, be sporting about that. Don't react too soon.

I rise today to oppose this Motion of Thanks to the President's Address, which my friend, Kamal Morarka and others, have said is the first Address and defines the parameters of this Government's policy. But to be

factually correct, I would like to remind that this is the second Address. In the first Address, when it came in December, we were told that it is only giving the defection of the policies which will be followed in future. I find now in this present Address certain contradiction if you read it along with the first Address. There were certain commitments which were made at that time. There were certain assurances given way back in December and we were expecting that by the time the Budget Session commences those assurances would be fulfilled. But I am very sad to point out that the present Government of the National Front and its constituents have gone back on the assurances which were given earlier during the election campaigns and in their manifestoes, but also in the previous President's Address.

I will point out two such commitments or assurances which have been repeated in a diluted form in this President's Address. One is about the right to work. It was in your manifesto. It was there in the previous Address of the President to the Parliament. When we are discussing that Motion of Thanks in December, I recall I was one of those Members who did put up an amendment on the right to work and friends of ruling party found it very embarrassing and opposed that amedment. Even friends belonging to the Marxist party joined hands with the BJP in opposing the amendment for the right to work, which was passed by this House. I am quite surprised again that they had the adaucity to mention that the Government was considering amending the Constitution. How long will you consider it? You are gloating about your success in bringing an amendment to repeal the 59th Amedment, which you did with our cooperation and support, but here you are still considering it. For how long will you keep on considering it? That was your commitment before the elections. That is how you misled and swayed the people of this country. It is only through gimmicks and tall promises, I must warn you, that you won the elections.

Populism is dangerous and competitive populism when you compete with each other is still more dangerous. It is particularly so when yours is a minority Government supported by a majority. But I must warn you that before you make a promise, before you make a commmitment you must recheck whether you are in a position to do that. I am saying that not as an opponent of this Government; I am saying this in all seriousness and am not trying to score a debating point. I am saying this because you are playing with the most explosive power in the society—the youth. If you promise them the Sun and the Moon, if you give unrealistic assurances to them and if you fail to fulfil them, then you will not be in a position to govern and will not be in a position to control the situation. The very mention of the right to work in the second Address is a farce and the Government should be ashamed of that.

The second farce is about the assurance given to the ex-servicemen. The present Prime Minister, when he was in the Opposition, was talking about the ex-servicemen, giving them an assurance that his party is committed to one-rank-one-pension. That was there in the election manifesto. That was there in the last Address of the President and that is again there in this Address. My friend, Kamal Morarka said "Hundred days is too early. Please don't judge us in hundred days." We will not judge you even in hundred days but we will certainly try to evaluate the direction in which you are taking us in hundred days. These first hundred days are very important and you will agree with me there. These two commitments could have been fulfilled in the first hundred days. You are still working out the modalities of one-rank one-pension.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Can you yield for a minute?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Yes.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I quite agree with you that the first hundred days will determine the direction of this Government. In the first hundred days, apart from 59th amendment of the Constitution which I said was done with your cooperation, there is the Lokpal Bill, the Prasar Bharati Bill and on the right to work in yesterday's budget, there is some sort of an employment guarantee scheme. However small it is a beginning. So they point to the direction. We have not fulfilled the "right to work." Everybody has not got employment in 100 days but the direction is clear.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: What I was cautioning my friends in the Government was, the danger of making unrealistic promises, inherent dangers involved in a populist approach because that was not possible when you said it. I am not saying that is possible. But you said it. You repeated over and over again and you don't have the courage now to come out with the truth but you continue with the farce by repeating it here and that is what I am objecting to. You never required hundred days or you don't require a fresh budget to fulfil your commitment to the ex-servicemen.

Sir, I will not go into details about the other economic promises which have been made to the people of this country and also the promises made to the farmers. There was a big talk about the price rise. Normally before every General Elections, there is a speculative increase in prices, but that became an election issue. They promised to the people of this country that the moment they get rid of the Congress Government they will bring down the prices. They accused us of being corrupt which they have not yet proved and I hope they will prove when they are still in office. That is why we are saying that hundred days may not be too much for a Government which reflects stability and continuity but hundred days may be too much for a Government which is rocked every second day by its own members. We do not know how long you would be there and that is why the nation is keen to have some quick results.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Only this Government can fulfil those things.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am not saying that.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, by the admission of Mr. Anand Sharma, it is very evident that something good has to be done to the country...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I don't expect any good from this Government. (*Interruptions*). I am not yielding. I can yield for a clarification or information... (*Interruptions*)...Well, I am a lawyer by profession.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG): Mr. Sharma, they are taking away your time.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I hope you will be indulgent. As I was saying when they made the promises, at that time they never thought that they will be in Government. But they know one thing that if they come in Government, by the time they had to answer about their performance, they will be out of it because they have competent people who act as stabilisers, as per them, destabilisers or wreckers as far as the nation is concerned. The same thing has happened about the prices. We all know where the prices were in September, October and November. We all know what the consumer price index is today. You have to answer it now. You cannot turn around and say that it was the previous Government. I will concede, for argument's sake, there may be some of the policies we pursued which, according to you, are wrong. I will concede. But today you cannot justify your failures by criticising the previous Government. Though you do not have a mandate, you have a responsibility.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: No mandate?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No. Certainly not. If anybody says that the present Government has a mandate, then it would be a travesty of truth. It is a minority Government. I will not call it a weak Government. I will refrain from saying that. But it is a minority Government. The political arithmetic is known to all of us.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): The clear mandate removed Rajiv Gandhi from power.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Let us discuss your future now. It is a minority Government which has majority support because of the support of the red flag and the saffron flag, the two extremes. And I find it very funny when Vajpayeeji and Dipen Ghoshji have to sing the same tune. (*Interruption*).

AN HON. MEMBER: Both of them are not here.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Well, I am sure they are represented. It is a very funny scenario because Dipen Ghosh or Members of his party may feel something else, but the constraints of the situation do not permit them to come out openly against the rabid communalism being fanned by the BJP. Even yesterday, for that matter, there was a hesitation to identify the culprits, the culprits responsible for the communal carnage in Delhi's Nizamuddin area. And then we have been accused that we do not help in the checking of the growth of the fundamentalist forces. But the present Government is doing that, is doing that by accepting the dictates of the BJP and through the BJP of the Shiv Sena. Well, it is very clear. We see what happened on the Doordarshan. We see their influence on the Government machinery. If that influence was not there, how, with prior information of something happening, complaints being filed to the police, written complaints being filed to the police, thousands and thousands of armed people assemble, they erect a wall, they contravene the law, a riot takes place and people are killed? If they have no influence over the administration, such a thing can never take place. And that has happened right under your nose, in the Capital of Delhi. You do not take this as criticism. I am pointing out certain lacunae. And in democratic spirit, please take this criticism and try to correct these aberations because these aberations may prove to be very costly for this nation.

Sir, wherever action is required, the present Government has a claim to make that they have taken action. What action? Forming a committee, constituting a panel, setting up a council. It is not a Government of national conciliation. It is a Government of national confusion. It is a Governmnet which evades the issues, a Government which runs away from thorny issues and real problems. It is a Government which evades its responsibilities and the only recourse it has is to set up a panel or a committee. I do not know how many panels or committees have been set up. (*Interruptions*). I am not talking, Madam, only of the electoral reforms. I will concede there that setting up a panel there is justified. Should I point out the other areas where formation... (*Interruption*).

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI: I will agree if a single specific allegation is made.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Well, you may feel so. But I am sure that the media and my colleagues... (*Interruption*). Well, I do not expect any understanding from this side. (*Interruption*).

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI: ... so far this harangue is just name calling. There have been so specific allegations.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : I have not called any names so far. I am stating facts. (*Interruption*). I think I can yield if you can enlighten us.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Con I advise the Madam about the convention of the House? The convention of the House is to stand up and address. You cannot talk sitting. This is not the convention of the House.

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI : I am sorry.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I hope you will be kind to me and not count this time in my turn. Sir, the issues involved are serious, serious enough to warrant early attention of the Government. In certain areas like the electoral reforms, I concede, set up a panel. It is a democratic decision to elicit the views of the other parties, but not in every thing; not for ex-servicemen, not for Mandal Commission. Sir, there are so many committees and panels, 31 to be precise, set up by this Government. All the 31 cannot be justified. I am very much justified in faulting this decision of the Government to set up a panel or a committee for everything rather than solving the issues. Sir, postponement of certain burning issues by taking recourse to this approach is doing a great disservice to the nation. It is not helping the nation in any manner. This Government, as per its performance of the last 100 days, is a Government of inaction, is a Government of non-performance, is a Government of Commissions, is a Government of panels and committees. Sir, I agree with what Shri Kamal Morarka has said about Kashmir and Punjab. These are very sensitive issues. We do not want to politicise them. I for one will be the last person to politicise these issues. These are national issues and we have to put our minds together, we have to work together to find a solution. But can you reflect what used to be your behaviour in the past? What was happening then? These issues were politicised when you were on the other side. You did politicise Kashmir and Punjab. And did it help you? You always used to say that the approach of the previous Government was wrong and even now you have said that because of that, the alienation has taken place. Suppose this statement of yours is correct and your earlier statement that our approach was faulty, our approach was not the correct approach, if all these statements are to be taken as correct, then may I say—we were incompetent and our approach was wrong and you were competent and your approach is correct; you are more committed, you have better merit; if that is true, then at least you should have been able to hold on to the situation as it existed in November. Now you answer : is the situation in Punjab and Kashmir the same as it was in November? What I am saying is when you have the competence, you have the merit, you have the policy—I am not trying to politicise it—at least you should have kept it where it was. If deterioration has taken place, who is answerable for that? We have every right to point if you are going wrong. Of course, we have to tell you. Who sends the wrong signals to the secessionists in Punjab? Who sends the wrong signals to the hostile leaders by condemning the previous Government's policy, not only internal policy but foreign policy. The pervious Government's policy of firmness *vis-a-vis* its neighbours, those neighbours who were helping directly or indirectly the secessionists, the militans and the terrorists, those neighbours who were responsible for the inflow of sophisticated weapons used for killing innocent people, women and children in this country? Who sends this wrong message, this signal of soft attitude through the condemnation of the policy of the previous Government? It is your Government. Now you have the results before you.

I would like to caution you : you did that, may be out of emotion, may be out of your desire to denigrate the

previous regime. Remember one thing. It takes time and it costs the nation much. Remember one thing : It takes time to bring back the nation to the right course.

Sir, I know that we are short of time. But I have just to make two or three issues, two or three points, here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG): Please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : This is going to be my last speech and I hope you will bear with me. What I am going to say is very important.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN : (West Bengal): You should come back.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : Very kind of you.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Mr. Sharma, at least you make intelligible points!

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : Thank you, Kamal. Now, Sir, they have given an assurance to respect the dignity of the institutions to pursue value-based politics, and to adopt a different mode of governance. Shri Shankerji has dealt in detail the question of their respect of the institutions. I am sure that no person who respects the Constitution and believes in the democratic spirit will approve of your decision of *en masse* sacking of the Governors, because when you were in the Opposition, even if one Governor was appointed—if he was a political appointee; either a former Chief Minister or a politician was appointed as Governor—you used to be up in Arms, making noise, and holding up the proceedings of this House and the other House. Do not forget that. Even when the previous Home Minister used to ring up the Chief Ministers of the non-Congress(I) States, you used to say that the consent was not taken, that the consent of the Chief Minister of the State concerned was not taken. I do not have to give instances for that. But this time, in the States ruled by the Congress(I), whether in Andhra Pradesh or in Karnataka, they did not bother to consult the Chief Ministers. And, who are your appointees? What are their antecedents? Have you shown any respect to the Constitution? Have you not politicised the institution of Governors? Can you justify this at all? Contradictions cannot be justified. I hope that as long as you are in the Government, there will be no more of such violation, but rather you will fulfil all your promises or some of your commitments.

There is a mention of the farmers in detail and there is a mention of the electoral system about the influence of money power and muscle power in our electoral system. This Address came in the month of March. But fourteen days before this Address, there was mayhem in Meham. But you will say that it is an isolated incident in one constituency...(*Interruptions*)...You must accept that there is a change of Government now and you must also accept that this is the second Address of the President after this Government came to power and now you are answerable.

श्री ईशदत्त यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): अमेठी का भी जिक्र कीजिए ।

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: अमेठी का जिक्र पुरानी कहानी है, वह सरकार चली गई अब आप अपना बोरिया-बिस्तर देखिए । . . . (व्यवधान)

Sir, Meham is not an ordinary constituency, but it is the Chief Minister's constituency, it is the constituency from which the Chief Minister is contesting and that Chief Minister happens to be the son of the Deputy Prime Minister. Scores of people have been gunned down; people have been deprived of their right to vote; people have been terrorised; the army had to be called in; and never before such a kind of violence was seen. When they talk of Bihar, they try to refer to our justify that by referring to the row between the former

[Shri Anand Sharma]

Chief Minister and the Election Commission. But what is the truth? Who gave the tickets to the criminals, to the murderers, to the history-sheeters? I must tell you, it is the leaders of the present ruling party... (*Interruptions*)...The senior leaders of the Janata Dal have come out openly condemning the allotment of party tickets to criminals. Many leaders of the Janata Dal know, everybody knows; we are sitting here, we are responsible people. Just to score a debating point don't try to cover the truth. Everybody knows, even in Meham. What is happening within this Government? I congratulate those bold, sincere, people who have openly condemned this most serious and murderous assault on democracy in Meham. You must have the courage, when something has gone wrong, to stand up and condemn it. You cannot talk of electoral reforms with simultaneously defending Meham. Don't do that ...(*Interruption*) (*Time bell rings*) I am about to conclude. There were two more things...

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI : In 1984 and in 1989 the kind of thing that happened in Amethi, both times by the sitting Prime Miniser, is unforgivable. One, this is not a debating point. There is no attempt to justify Meham at all. But I never heard you or anybody else on your side for five years uttering a word about Amethi, both times. I think you might justify that we on our side should put right Meham. I agree. But on your side have you ever talked about what happened in Amethi? You don't have the moral authority now.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : The lady Minister has intervened in the discussion. Perhaps, if I am correct, this is her maiden intervention in this House. I would only say that when we discuss these things, none of the sides can justify but let me tell you, we have not heard of anything going wrong in Amethi in 1984 ... (*Interruption*)

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI : I was the victim. (*Interruption*). There was stabbing, shooting, killing, arresting. Everybody knew. There are photographs ...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : In 1989 ...

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI: The photographs appeared in the papers in 1984. The papers had published them on the front pages, in all the UP papers because they never made it to Delhi because your party won. It had 600 out of 800 booths captured. Nobody said a word about it at that time or talked about it because you won it with an overwhelming majority. It does not justify it.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : I am happy that the honourable lady Minister has brought this point about 1989. I would like to remind that at that time I was the spokesman of my party and as a spokesman of my party I articulated the decision of the party, the feeling of the party, in condemning in unequivocal terms the violence in Amethi. It is a matter of record. I never make an incorrect statement because I am quoting myself. Not only that. I would like to inform this House that my party at that time agreed for the repoll...

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI : Did you ask for a total repoll?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : I may enlighten you on one aspect today. The Deputy Commissioner and the Superintendent of Police were changed. There were Central observers, some socalled independent observers. All of them became non-independent immediately after the change of Government. They became members of the Planning Commission. They became Advisers. They were made Governors. I think all were there When that repoll took place in almost a hundred polling booths—to place this on record I would like to say—in the repoll in Amethi in November, 1989 more voters turned up in the presence of media, national and international observers, and in those

booths the winning candidate who happened to be the former Prime Minister, polled over 90% of votes. Let anybody get up and contradict it. I am talking of the repoll. If anybody is trying to create this impression ...

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA : What does it prove?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : If anybody is trying to give this impression. That former PM could not win without violence—it is wrong. That proves one thing that the violence earlier was confined to one Assembly segment because of the rivalry between the Janata Dal candidate for the Assembly constituency and the Congress candidate. It was switching of sides for them. And, Madam, Minister knows that very well. But I think it was important for me to inform what was the result of the repoll.

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI : May I say something? Firtly, all 98 were not in one MLA constituency. They were spread over all five. Secondly, by the time the repoll came along, the fact of the matter, I think, was that no matter what you or I may think, by the time when the repoll came along, the people were too scared to go and vote.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG): Madam, I will request you to address the Chair.

SHRI M. M. JACOB (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have asked for a discussion in the form of a Calling Attention or any other form on the things that have happened in Meham, violence in elections. Perhaps we may be spending more time if we are cross-examine what happened in one constituency or another constituency.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : I will certainly not repeat but make a brief mention of what the Leader of the Opposition had said, leader of a party, about selecting people for national awards.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG) : Please conclude now.

SHR ANAND SHARMA : The manner in which it has been done cannot be justified. The criterion for selecting people for the highest national award should be their merit, and contribution. The criterion should not be animosity to a particular person or a particular political party. If this approach is not followed, then the awards themselves will lose all relevance and significance. About that you have to be careful. If you say you had reservations about some people who might have been picked up earlier, I do not know, because you have not named them. Well, I do not mind, frankly speaking. But that doesn't justify your picking up people on this criterion. That does not justify at all. The people who had carried on a vituperative attack on political consideration ...

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY WITH ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI ARIF MOHD. KHAN): Would you like to know?

SHR ANAND SHARMA : I am sure that lists are there. If the lady Minister has any reservations, I don't mind yielding and I don't mind yielding to ladies.

SHRI ARIF MOHD. KHAN : You are very graceful.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : Thank you ...

Sir, I want to conclude. But before I conclude, Mr. Vice-Chairman, two more points I have to make. One is about the Prasar Bharati Bill and the autonomy of the media. Right from the word 'go' they have said : there is a change now, we are going to make the media autonomous, there will be no bias, it will not be used for political propaganda. Sir, may I ask — we have the Minister for Information

[Shri Anand Sharma]

and Broadcasting also here—immediately after the change of the Government how many Station Directors and how many News Directors were removed, because they refused to obey their orders, to censor the news and they refused to toe the political line, not the official line? They are talking of Prasar Bharati Bill. I am happy it will be brought during this session.

Those Members who have been speaking about the Prasar Bharati Bill, I hope, have read it. It is the most diluted version of the Bill which was brought in 1978. And that was also a diluted version of the recommendations of the Verghese Committee. You go back to 1978 when the exercise started. In the present Bill every step has been taken to ensure that political appointees are not only kept there but protected. Every clause is aimed at ensuring total take-over, though overtly a legalised takeover, of the electronic media and the mass media in the country. Sir, I just have to give you one instance. There used to be a statement every alternate day on the Doordarshan during the recent Assembly elections that a three-member team has gone to Geneva, that the C.B.I. has filed an application in the court and that the team has now gone to Stockholm. They kept on repeating it till the day of polling. Along with the news item, in the window or *khidki* of Doordarshan, they used to have a picture of the Bofors gun. Sometimes they used to show it on the full screen. May I ask what happened to the Doordarshan in December and in January? What prevented them from coming out with the same news item earlier? Sir, for the common man, the use of the word 'letter of rogatory' and amendment to the Criminal Procedure Code is confusing. I used to tell my friends that these letter of rogatories are being sent under a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the previous Government and the Criminal Procedure Code was amended by the previous Government. There letters of rogatories were sent. It is a matter of record. But suddenly the live media became alive in February. It was misused to an extent that for the first time they gave an analysis of the PTI TV on the Doordarshan about the outcome of the elections. And that was after the campaigning was over. It was highlighted repeatedly. They even pinpointed that in this State this party will form the Government. It was done much before the polling. Was that not a gross misuse for political purposes? Is that the autonomy which you are trying to create? If this is what you are trying to achieve through the Prasar Bharati Bill, then God save the media and the country.

I will conclude by just making two or three points on foreign policy. I know that I have taken time. I agree with my dear friend, Kamal, that the foreign policy is an area where there should not be any difference of opinion. I do know that the present Foreign Minister also makes public his commitment to the Nehruvian policy. The Government also talks of non-alignment. I am not trying to find fault here at all. But there is an area where a wrong message has gone. I will quickly point it out first *vis-a-vis* our neighbour because this Address is full of improving relations with our neighbours, with Bangladesh, with Nepal, with Sri Lanka and unfortunately not with Pakistan. We all know that initially, after the election euphoria, claims were made that they are going ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG): The Minister has to give reply at 3.00 o'clock.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : I am concluding. But should I remind about the statement of President Irshad on Kashmir? Is that the success of your foreign policy? Should I remind you that only by condemning the previous Government's policy on Sri Lanka, you have not be friended Sri Lanka as you promise in this President's Address.

Unfortunately I am running out of time. But there are two things which I would like to point out. We are very happy when you mention that the Prime Minister has gone to Nimibia. It is a reiteration of our solidarity with the people of Africa. Correct. I should mention here that there is a reference in this address about the constitution of a Reception Committee for Nelson Mandela, a great hero who has been released because of international pressure after over 27 years of incarceration. This Government, constituted a Reception Committee. Yes, I welcome that. But today India has the dubious distinction of only forming the Reception Committee and not celebrating his release. Even in London, when Nelson Mandela was released, there were half a million people in the Trafalgar Square. Even in the United States of America and even in the F.R.G. where the Governments had supported the Pretoria regime, people celebrated his release. Here till this date no public function has been organised. The Reception Committee of which I am also a member has not even met. Let me tell you, Sir, that it was a matter of shame for us that two officials — junior officials I will repeat — went to meet Nelson Mandela on behalf of the Government. If not in South Africa, when Nel-
3 P.M. son Mandela was in Zamzia or in Lusaka or in Daras Salaam or in Stockholm, couldn't you send immediately after his release, at least your External Affairs Minister or a Cabinet-rank Minister? And then you say that this is the Reception Committee which we have constituted. Reception Committee for what? Because, today the time of celebrating his release is over, the time has come when the world is watching what developments are taking place in South Africa after his release. So, I am just pointing out as a friend the area where you have failed. And I hope that friends like Kamal Morarka will bring right pressure on their Government in future to correct these aberrations.

I do not have more to add, Sir, I will conclude by saying that where our national interest is involved, you will never find us lacking in supporting the Government's initiatives, particularly on the sensitive issues like Kashmir and Punjab. But your approach should also be not one of confrontation and vendetta. Your approach should not be to postpone the burning issues but you should try to work in harmony, not in harmony with the communal forces but with progressive and secular forces of the country to ensure that India is not plunged into instability and chaos. And, Sir, with these words, I have no option but to oppose this Motion of Thanks on the President's Address which is full of platitudes and vain talk.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG): Before the Civil Aviation Minister replies, I have to make one announcement that the Business Advisory Committee, at its meeting held on the 15th March, 1990 have taken a decision that the Prime Minister will reply to the debate on Friday, the 23rd March, 1990, immediately after the Question Hour is over. Now, the Minister of Civil Aviation will reply to the clarifications.

श्री राम चन्द्र विकल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : समाप्त करें क्य ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री मीर्जा इ शाद बेग) : इनके बाद चच फिर आरम्भ होगी। We will try to finish it today.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Accident to the Indian Airlines Airbus A-320 Aircraft at Bangalore—contd.

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY WITH ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI ARIF MOHD. KHAN): Sir, the other day, I had made a statement in the House about the unfortunate and tragic accident which took place just outside the Bangalore airport and